HUMAN EVENTS

Volume XII, No. 47 Saturday, November 19, 1955 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

Adlai's Return: Washington's general reaction is that Adlai Stevenson's announcement of his candidacy for the Democratic nomination for president reveals the weakness of the Democratic Party in this Presidential year. All it means now is that the one-time loser has obtained, pro-tem, support from more machine politicos and labor bosses than any other New Deal hopeful in the party and that these so-called leaders await a lead from the people, at the first primaries. Soundings from all points of the compass indicate Adlai has no mass popularity.

But — say observers — really vital forces in the Democratic Party are stirring against that Party's liberal bosses. Various signs and portents are reported to HUMAN EVENTS from different parts of the country.

(1) Local sentiment flared against Adlai when he was booked to make the Woodrow Wilson centennial speech in Virginia. Reports from Charlottesville say that the anti-Adlai attitude popped up rather rudely among those gathered for the speech. Also, halfway across the continent, from Minneapolis, comes a report of the booing of Stevenson, at an appearance there. And so on.

(2) The great Democratic victory in Indiana municipal elections was characterized by a rise of conservative sentiment among Democrats in that state. The Democratic victor in Indianapolis, according to the Indianapolis *Star,* is very conscious that he won because Republican conservatives scratched their ballots, and has hastened to assure citizens that no left-wingers will get jobs in the City Hall. Also, the *Star* (November 13) reports that one Democratic figure, Roger Branigan, comes to the fore as a possible Democratic candidate for governor next year. He is a conservative.

The winning Democratic leaders in Indiana's capital, it seems, favor not Adlai but conservative Governor Frank Lausche of Ohio, for the nomination. The *Star* sees an upheaval in the Indiana Democratic party and considers the possibility that Lausche may have "powerful support" in the Indiana Democratic delegation to the convention next year.

As a result of the Democratic victory and this ferment in the Democratic Party, according to the *Star,* there is a developing "upheaval" in the Indiana Republican Party, with the conservatives under Senator Jenner looming as the real power as against Governor Craig, GOP "liberal" and slavish follower of Eisenhower. Blame is placed on the Craig regime for the Republican defeat last week.

(3) Rising conservative feeling found expression throughout the country not only in balloting for candidates but also in referendums. The defeat of the CIO plan for supplemental unemployment pay (see "The Ohio Story" below) was matched by the New York voters' rejection of a proposal to increase gasoline and diesel fuel taxes to underwrite a highway bond issue. The same voters also turned down a sewer debt proposal, and the *New York Times* (November 13) saw the referendum results as a "manifestation of statewide revolt against higher taxes." Similar reports came in from other parts of the country.

President's Return: The President is in Gettysburg after making a stop — for some reason not clearly explained — in Washington. What is clear is that the Palace Guard worked very hard at providing a welcome for Ike's return to Washington.

The White House aides reportedly phoned every foreign diplomatic mission in the Capital, urging that representatives be present at the President's arrival at National Airport; contacted the staffs of

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

members of Congress on Capitol Hill, suggesting they likewise rally to the return; and sent some rather expensive telegrams to members of the GOP in the metropolitan area telling them to show up.

According to local newsrooms, the President's arrival and the procession to the White House did not prove (as previously billed) "tremendous" — the estimate was that 35,000 turned out, not a high figure in this city of parades. No one here doubts that everyone in the area was genuinely glad to know the President was back and was happy that he was sufficiently recovered to make the trip.

But the phenomenon of the return was less discussed than the phenomenon of the efforts of the eager beavers in the White House who agonizingly want him to run again — no matter how cruel and tragic a decision is thereby pressed on an ailing man. As one joker put it: "Looks like they simply want Ike to be a constitutional monarch, like the King of England — who merely signs papers and lets the Premier and cabinet secretaries do all the work and make the decisions." Joking or not, anyone here would readily classify Mr. Sherman Adams as Premier.

Nevertheless, most opinions from veterans in the Capital are that Ike will not run again. This feeling was fortified by the resignation last week of White House Secretary (for appointments) Bernard Shanley. This New Jersey man had been exceptionally devoted to the President and, before the latter's illness, had been convinced that he would run again out of sense of duty. Shanley now reportedly is planning to mount a campaign for Stassen for President (he was Stassen floor manager at the '52 GOP convention).

Knowland: Californians have been surprised by statements in the "liberal" press that Chief Justice Warren, if persuaded to run, would prove the best vote-getter among Republican hopefuls. Certainly — they say — this is not borne out by California election statistics of the past.

These figures, familiar to most Californians, but little known elsewhere in the country, show that Senator William F. Knowland is the biggest vote-getter on record in the Sunset state. In 1952, he ran for re-election to the U.S. Senate. He won both Republican and Democratic nominations (as a result of the cross-filing system of California) not an uncommon phenomenon in that state. He was challenged by an Independent-Progressive in the general election in November, 1952. Knowland won with a vote of 3,982,448 as against his opponent's 542,270 — a majority of almost 3½ millions. He far outpaced Eisenhower in that election — the latter getting 2,897,310 as against Stevenson's 2,197,548. Knowland's majority is the greatest on record in California.

Nixon: Friends of Vice President Nixon scarcely conceal their bitterness when asked why Nixon did not give the oration at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier at Arlington Cemetery last week. The Vice President, as a ceremonial substitute for the convalescent President, was the obvious official to fill this annual role this year. Instead, the invitation to make the annual classic speech was reportedly sent from Denver to former President Herbert Hoover. Why?

Few in the Capital believe the sick President had any volition in the matter — quite probably he simply signed a letter to Mr. Hoover, presented him by Sherman Adams. The speculation among those who cover the interregnum government is that Adams and his Palace Guard chose this occasion to keep Nixon out of one of the most politically visible and powerful "spots" in an election year, the Armistice Day memorial ceremony.

This incident lights up the division in the ranks of Eisenhower Republicans and is not auspicious for their success in coming months (if the President does not run) in bringing the GOP into line behind a "liberal" candidate — in the face of the growing strength and morale of the right-wing of the party.

The failure of the President's "spirit of Geneva" (*vide* this week's complete collapse of the Foreign Minister's meeting) is assessed as a bad blow to the "liberal" wing of the GOP.

Straws In Wind: In the interregnum, or indeed in any election year at this time, observers in Washington watch for resignations of prominent officials. Sometimes the official espys a good job in private business and prefers to take it rather than to remain where he is, in constant uncertainty

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about the permanence of his position until the national election results are known. There is, for instance, the case of Admiral Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. Those who know Strauss predict that after the first of the year he will resign. The Chairman is wealthy and seeks no other job. But he is a conservative (friend of the late Senator Taft), conscientiously wants to do his present task well and dislikes the forensics and intrigues of an election year.

Reuther Reverse: An A.P. dispatch (November 11) from Hagerstown, Indiana, records the fact that Reuther's United Auto Workers union was rejected by the employees of the Perfect Circle piston ring company in the Hagerstown and nearby Richmond plants. The NLRB, which conducted the de-certification election among these workers, released figures showing that the employees turned down the UAW by decisive majorities.

The Ohio Story: Washington political analysts are devoting much study to last week's Ohio referendum where a devastating defeat — 1,470,000 to 880,000 — was administered to the CIO which sought to legalize private unemployment payments as supplemental to state unemployment benefits. The initiated law provided that the state unemployment benefits could have gone as high as $59 a week as against the present maximum of $39 per week and the maximum period would have become 39 weeks instead of 26 weeks.

By their verdict, Ohio voters showed that they recognized the evil of "too much pay for no work" (a tax free income of $256 a month for as long as 9 months).

The vote confirmed the belief of many political experts that the voters generally are much more conservative than the politicians. The initiative and referendum has been in effect in a number of states for four decades or longer; the results — with few exceptions — are pro-conservative. Voters indicate they would rather spend their own money than have it spent for them by government.

Politicians are more leftish than the voters because the labor and liberal elements are better organized and more articulate and belligerent than the Right. If an office-holder rejects a labor proposal, the labor press thereafter alludes to him as "anti-labor." If the reason for the label were given, the voters — including many labor members — would say that the politician was antagonistic, not to labor, but to dictatorship by labor bosses. The smear is used as a substitute for reasoned argument.

The 1950 election in Ohio suggests the antidote. When the labor bosses called Robert A. Taft "anti-labor," the Senator boldly took the issue to the voters and explained in detail the justification for every clause in the Taft-Hartley law. He ended up with a majority of 430,000. Today the overwhelming Ohio vote against SUP (supplemental unemployment payments) offers presumptive evidence that the people would vote against it in each of the other 47 states if the issue were put to them.

Reuther's counter-strategy: The referendum method is obviously futile for Reuther, but he is clearly unworried; he expects to get administrative rulings in a sufficient number of other states to validate the contracts.

He has also indicated that the supplemental unemployment payments will be made even in states where the plan is declared illegal. Under one of his new plans for evading the law, the laid-off worker would collect unemployment compen-

---

CHARLES EDISON, Former Governor of New Jersey says of HUMAN EVENTS: "As a reader of HUMAN EVENTS for several years, I was delighted to learn from actual experience what an appreciated gift it could be at Christmas time. Last Christmas I gave several subscriptions to friends and they are repeatedly reminding me of their appreciation. To me, HUMAN EVENTS serves as a wonderful antidote to the political news which, all too often, is slanted, innocently or purposely, to the Left."

TAYLOR CALDWELL, Noted Author of many best-selling novels says: "The man or woman who does not subscribe to HUMAN EVENTS is only half literate about the world today, for the newspapers will not, or dare not, publish the significant or disturbing events occurring in our country. *Since an unknown friend, and I do mean friend,* subscribed for a few issues of HUMAN EVENTS for me, I have eagerly awaited its arrival every week. Not only is the regular newssheet appallingly enlightening, but the articles accompanying it give an insight into the terrible doings of the enemies of America, thus alerting all patriotic citizens. As the Moslems say, 'A man armed with knowledge is a man armed.' And we need armed men these days."

J. E. SCHAEFER, Vice President, Boeing Airplane Co., General Manager, Wichita Division: "HUMAN EVENTS is somewhat new to me and Mrs. Schaefer — refreshingly new. Our introduction to HUMAN EVENTS occurred at Christmas time when my good friend General Wedemeyer sent us a gift subscription. We are indeed grateful to him for his thoughtfulness and to HUMAN EVENTS for its informative, fair and dynamic coverage of current issues and events."

You know of people who will be as grateful to you for a gift subscription to HUMAN EVENTS as Mr. Schaefer is to General Wedemeyer.

Act on impulse; order gift subscriptions for them today!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sation for the maximum period — or until he goes back to work — and then collect SUP benefits in a single payment, from the trust fund set up by the employer.

FORD EMPLOYEES WAKE UP: When Reuther demanded the Guaranteed Annual Wage, Ford made a counter offer: that employees could buy Ford Motor Company stock at half price on a weekly deduction plan.

Reuther scorned the offer; his personal prestige was tied to GAW. In the last week, on news of the Ford Motor Company's public sale of stock, many Ford workers apparently concluded that Reuther had sold them down the river. Workers with seniority are rarely laid off, and then, for only short periods of time. Now they realize they could make $8 or $10 a week extra out of the Ford stock purchase plan. The President of the Ford local has written a letter to the Ford Motor Company urging that employees be given the chance to buy stock at half price — but he doesn't say anything about cancelling SUP. In other words, the Ford local's chieftain wants to have the cake and eat it too.

Soviet Propaganda: While Dulles worries about Soviet export of arms, American immigration officials show great concern about what is said to be a truly enormous export of Soviet propaganda material — to the United States.

One statement we hear is that over 1 million pieces per month goes through the port of New Orleans, originating not only from Soviet Russia, but also from satellites and even from cities in the so-called "free countries." Another estimate is that at least one shipload a day, on the average, arrives in the port of New York. Those who know what is going on along the West Coast say that large amounts come in constantly from the Orient, principally through San Francisco. Almost all of the material — lauding Soviet Russia's accomplishments and attacking the United States — is in English.

But there is also importation of pamphlets, etc., in various foreign languages, aimed at certain ethnic minorities — Polish, South Slav, Hungarian, etc. Much of the latter goes to foreign language newspapers here — of which there are some 300. There is also noted quite a flow of this propaganda material to schools and colleges.

The authorities at the ports do not have sufficient staffs to screen away any more than a negligible percentage of this stuff, and there seems to be no pressure from the heads of the Executive Branch to deal with and confiscate this incoming Red propaganda.

New Publications: Fulton Lewis, Jr., national news commentator on Mutual Broadcasting System offers a weekly "Digest and Analysis of Washington Intelligence for Limited Distribution," to be published every Wednesday by Special Reports, Inc., 1627 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. The first issue announces that the weekly will be for "private distribution" and that an "annual fee will be quoted on request." Inquiry at Mr. Lewis' office brings the news that the annual fee will be $28.

● William F. Buckley, Jr., this week launched *The National Review*, a conservative weekly journal of opinion, of which Mr. Buckley — author of *God and Man at Yale* and *McCarthy and His Enemies* — is editor and publisher. Other editors on the staff include: James Burnham, author of *The Web of Subversion;* Willmoore Kendall, professor of political science, Yale University; Suzanne LaFollette, former managing editor, *The Freeman;* William S. Schlamm, former editor, *Fortune* magazine; and Jonathan Mitchell, former associate editor, *Newsweek*. The journal is published at 211 East 37 Street, New York 16, N. Y. Price per year — $7.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

Pre-publication price *(only until December 31)* on 1955 BOUND ANNUAL VOLUME with complete index, $7.50. After January 1, $15. A few 1954 Bound Volumes are available at $15.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3. By first class mail, $11.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $13 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $12 a year; airmail, $18. **Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.**

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D.C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D.C. Copyright 1955.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Volume XII, No. 47 HUMAN EVENTS November 19, 1955

Article Section

IN THE NAME OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Liberals Demand Teaching Monopoly

By E. MERRILL ROOT

This article is a chapter from Professor Root's new book *Collectivism on the Campus,* published by Devin-Adair Co., priced at $5. Copies may be ordered from HUMAN EVENTS.

THE COLLECTIVIST attack, whether by Communists, fellow-travellers, or Fabians, is so nearly overwhelming that few professors dare affirm what Emerson called "the infinitude of the private man." To these leftists, this is a major academic heresy.

Yet, even so, there remain a few professors who are skeptical of the omnipotent State and of economics as the essential factor in all human affairs — cultural, philosophical, artistic, religious. They hold an older, deeper faith. And, as radical conservatives, they refuse to be Laodicean and passive: they will speak even if their heads, to be unbowed, must be bloody.

In considering what happens to the conservative professor, we may well begin with the clarifying statement of one of the fairest and wisest college presidents, President Emeritus William Cullen Dennis of Earlham College. Dr. Dennis, in an interview, told the author:

> "It is the left-wing professor today who has the better chance of retaining his position even if he is incompetent. The reason is clear. The president and trustees of any college today know that if any left-wing professor is dismissed for a reason in no way connected with his ideology, there will be immediate accusations of 'suppression,' of attack upon his 'ideas,' and of violation of 'academic freedom.'
>
> "On the other hand, a conservative professor, if dismissed, will have no talking point to use as a shield, because his dismissal by supposedly 'conservative' authorities will never be attributed to any 'ideas' he holds. The conservative professor, moreover, will have no militant and vocal group to lead his defense. The result naturally is that college presidents or trustees today will always hesitate and fear to dismiss a 'liberal' or even a 'radical' collectivist from their college, but that they will never hesitate to dismiss a conservative professor if he is incompetent. . . . Today the 'liberal' professor is almost sure to be retained even if incompetent; but the conservative professor can be dismissed without causing even a ripple in the academic lake."

That Dr. Dennis is right is proved by many case-histories of what has happened to conservative professors in American colleges today. The virulence and success of the collectivist attack upon the conservative professor is illustrated by the experience of Dr. Kenneth W. Colegrove when he was called to Queens College, Flushing, New York. It is a decisive case. The documentation is complete, unanswerable, and can be

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

set down in the words of the collectivists themselves. It reveals, side by side, item by item, the "liberals'" attack upon the conservative professor and their defense of the collectivist professor. The contrasting treatments are documented in one issue of the official student paper of Queens College, *The Crown*. (There was a second newspaper, *The Rampart*, which was neutral.) Under perfect objective control, we can check and recheck, compare and evaluate, the bias for the collectivist and the prejudice against the conservative. It is a perfect case.

In 1953, after his retirement as professor of political science at Northwestern University, Dr. Colegrove was invited by the President of Queens College to join the faculty, and he accepted his appointment. On learning this, a militant minority of the faculty of Queens and a militant group of students influenced by the left-wing faculty members attacked the appointment. This group controlled *The Crown*. Professor Oscar Shaftel, assistant professor of English and invoker of the Fifth Amendment, had been and was "faculty adviser to *The Crown*." The militant minority, having usurped this means of college publicity, attacked Professor Colegrove's appointment and character in a long article and in an editorial.

THE IRE of the collectivists at Queens College against Professor Colegrove stemmed from his testimony before the McCarran Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security Laws. In 1951, Dr. Colegrove had been subpoenaed to tell the subcommittee what he knew about the Communist-controlled Institute of Pacific Relations. He was a reluctant witness. He knew that his testimony would be damaging to the reputation of several other professors. But he felt that it was his duty, as an American citizen, to answer all questions of the subcommittee without equivocation. The record shows that after being questioned as to Owen Lattimore and a secret conference of the State Department, of which both Professors Lattimore and Colegrove were members, Dr. Colegrove was questioned about Ambassador Philip C. Jessup, the chairman of the conference. Reluctantly, Dr. Colegrove testified that the State Department's White Paper on China, which Ambassador Jessup had edited, was dishonest, and that Jessup had, at times, followed the "Communist Party line."*

The subheading over the article in *The Crown* on Dr. Colegrove read: POLI. SCI. PROF. CALLED JESSUP PRO-LEFTIST. The article went on to say that Professor Kenneth W. Colegrove, "who in 1951 testified before the Senate Internal Security subcommittee that Professor Owen Lattimore had followed the Communist Party line, will be appointed to a professorship in the political science department here. . . ." The main headline read: "Faculty Protest Colegrove Appointment." This was untrue, for only the leftward part of the faculty "protested." *The Crown* said: "The objection by these faculty members, who read Dr. Colegrove's testimony before the Senate subcommittee, was that by nature of his replies he has largely destroyed his reputation for objective scholarship." *The Crown* (Feb. 13, 1953) added that "a Harvard professor [unnamed] who had also been accused of being 'pro-Communist' by Dr. Colegrove denied the statement publicly and warned against the 'unreliability' of such witnesses as Dr. Colegrove." *The Crown* added: "Several faculty members, upon hearing of Colegrove's appointment, have expressed the general misgivings that since Dr. Colegrove has assumed the role of an 'informer' before Senate Committees,

*Hearings before the Subcommittee on Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Eighty-second Congress, First Session regarding the Institute of Pacific Relations.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they could be placed in the position of finding themselves hampered in the expression of their opinions and conclusions as scholars for fear that testimony would be given against them."

This makes Dr. Colegrove seem a shabby fellow. Reason should remind us, however, that Professor Colegrove was testifying under oath before a Senate subcommittee and was not an "informer" when he freely expressed *his own* "opinions and conclusions" as a scholar.

TO COMPLETE the picture, in which Dr. Colegrove is painted so black, we must look at the other half, in which Professor Oscar Shaftel is painted very white. Professor Shaftel, also, was given headlines — and they were set *above* those of Dr. Colegrove. Dr. Shaftel, appearing also before a Senate Internal Security Subcommittee had *refused* to testify and so was *not* an "informer." The headlines splashed the two professors across the page thus: SHAFTEL TESTIFIES BEFORE SENATE GROUP, FACULTY PROTEST COLEGROVE APPOINTMENT. Notice the position *The Crown* takes. Both men had appeared before a Senate subcommittee. One of them had to the best of his ability helped the subcommittee; the other had refused to do so. *The Crown* calls the man who testified an "informer," whereas *The Crown* upholds as a martyr the man who refused to answer all questions while giving the clear impression in its headline that he *had* given complete testimony.

In the one article, Dr. Colegrove is dubbed an "informer," is referred to simply as "Colegrove," is charged with having "largely destroyed his reputation for objective scholarship," and is labeled "unreliable" by an anonymous "Harvard professor." In the other article, Dr. Shaftel is upheld; his remark that "the Senators are in the full flush of victory but they are afraid of the people" is quoted verbatim: his attitudes and oratory before the committee are reported in detail. The statement which Dr. Shaftel wished to read to the committee is quoted, and so is his denunciation of the "obscene spectacle of college presidents falling all over themselves, like Keystone cops, in haste to fire teachers who have taken a principled stand." Such a statement, *The Crown* felt, did not destroy Dr. Shaftel's "reputation for objective scholarship." And the implication is present that Dr. Colegrove had not taken a "principled stand."

Finally, not content with giving Dr. Shaftel approximately a column more than Dr. Colegrove in the news story, the editors also wrote *two editorials* praising and defending Dr. Shaftel and, incidentally, attacking Dr. Colegrove. One editorial entitled, "Who's Next?," said that the editors "resent the investigation of a well-loved, respected professor . . . by Senator Jenner, the man who called General Marshall a traitor." (What had the editors been reading?) The editorial goes on to say: "We firmly believe that teachers of all shades of political opinion have the right to teach. It is significant, though, that while people like Dr. Shaftel and Dr. Shlakman are penalized for their opinions, others who hold opposite, but equally extreme opinions are promoted, and *a man like Dr. Colegrove* appointed. . . . One of Dr. Shaftel's greatest fears is that people are becoming brutalized into accepting the rules of a few overzealous, confused Americans. Let's show him we are not brutalized, and will not sit and watch our half of the world go crazy." (Italics added.)

Not content with one editorial, *The Crown* added a second, in the same issue, entitled "Friday the 13th." This speaks of the day as "this blackest of Fridays when we must announce the Congressional interrogation of Dr. Shaftel. . . . If you believe in such things as black cats, broken mirrors,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Friday the thirteenth, you can console yourself by saying, 'It was all in the books.' We have no consolation."

NOW JUST who were these professors, Dr. Shaftel and Dr. Shlakman? Both of these professors are listed in the report of the Jenner subcommittee as witnesses who invoked the Fifth Amendment to evade questions as to their membership in the Communist Party. Moreover, in that same report, Dr. William H. Withers, chairman of the department of economics at Queens College, said in his testimony before the Jenner subcommittee:

> "The method of operation of these professors, Shaftel and [Shlakman] was primarily through constant personal contacts with students, after class hours. Both of these two teachers were popular teachers with students and they made constant efforts to become friends with students on the campus. They attended practically all of the important student meetings. They sponsored student organizations, particularly of a liberal variety. They associated with students off campus, in the homes of the other students *who were either affiliated with the Communist Party or sympathetic to the Communist Party.*" (Italics added.)

The senatorial subcommittee established the fact that Professors Shaftel and Shlakman have been affiliated with Communist groups, and the professors themselves, invoking the Fifth Amendment, refused to say whether or not they were then or had ever been Communist Party members. Their influence had been wide and deep among the student body at Queens College. The article and editorials in *The Crown* prove how wide and deep it was. (And it survives, even after their departure.) For the dismissal of a Fifth Amendment professor, the editors had, in their own words, "no consolation."

Such is the ordeal by "liberalism" which is the norm in American colleges today. Militant forces of a great municipal college, rooted in the aggressive collectivist minority of teachers and students, spoke solidly *against* the conservative who sought to defend the Constitutional Republic and *for* the collectivist who refused to help the Constitutional Republic. It is the conservative professor today who must endure the virulence of such attacks.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $20; 1,000 for $30. In quantities of 5,000 or more, $20 per thousand.

E. Merrill Root is Professor of English at Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana, and author of six books of poetry.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS for new subscribers only: 6 weeks for $1.

The Intercollegiate Society of Individualists (ISI) was organized to encourage the natural spirit of protest among college students. ISI engages in no regimentation. Students are encouraged to think for themselves, to form their own conclusions. It is the fastest growing organization in the colleges today. Its membership in the 1955-6 school year should exceed that of the very active, usually faculty-supported student branch of the Americans for Democratic Action (Students for Democratic Action). If you wish to pay for gift subscriptions to members of ISI — none sent except to students expressing a desire for HUMAN EVENTS — make out your check to "Intercollegiate Society of Individualists" and mail in care of HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K St., N.W., Washington 6, D. C. College-year subscriptions (8 months) are $5.50 each. You can pay for 5 subscriptions for $27.50; 10 for $55; 20 for $110; 100 for $550.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED